

Minutes of the Redevelopment Agency of Murray City and Murray City Planning Commission joint work meeting held Wednesday, February 16, 2005 in the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Attendance:

Jim Brass	Frank Nakamura	Josh Ewing
Jeff Dredge	Paul Jacobs	Lee Jimenez
Robert Robertson	Jacob Santini	Duane Phillips
Krista Dunn	Scott Baker	Brandon Bonham
Pat Griffiths	Donnetta Mitchell	Reed Cutler
Lynden Cheshire	Karen Snarr	Krisel Travis
David Hunter	Dick Stauffer	Don Mullen
Sherri VanBibber	T. Orden Yost	Art LaFeber
Ray Black	Susan Dewey	Soren Simonsen
Jeff Evans	Tom Henry	Tom Saul
Mayor Dan Snarr	Jennifer Brass	Jay Bollwinkel
Dennis Hamblin	Marjorie Brass	Larry Becknell
Keith Snarr	Ron Richter	Bob Fisher
Shannon Jacobs	Jim Paraskeva	Steven Whitehead
Carol Heales	Tom Love	

The meeting was called to order by Jim Brass, Redevelopment Agency Chair. The meeting was a joint work meeting of the Murray City Redevelopment Agency and the Murray City Planning Commission. He noted that there was not a Quorum of Planning Commission Members; officially this would be a meeting of the RDA. He also mentioned that this was strictly an informational meeting and that there would be no decisions made, so the lack of a Planning Commission Quorum was not a major issue.

Item 1. Fireclay Redevelopment Project Area Plan Workshop

The single item on the agenda was to discuss a redevelopment plan for the proposed Fireclay Redevelopment Survey Area. Karen Wikstrom was introduced as the planning consultant.

Karen Wikstrom introduced Jan Streiffel from Landmark Design who is a member of the planning team. Karen described the purpose of the meeting as a workshop and an opportunity to discuss the project in terms of the goals and objectives for the area. This will allow the consultants to take this information and create a plan.

A number of sketches were created for the project area to foster ideas about various uses, placement of uses and other issues. The intent was to suggest possibilities. There are two simultaneous processes, a small area plan and an RDA Plan. As the small area is developed it will be submitted to the planning commission as a small area plan. At the end of the process a small area plan will be adopted with a redevelopment plan to provide

implementation power. The redevelopment plan will always reference the small area plan as the guiding planning document for the redevelopment project.

The first item discussed was what the overall project goals need to be. There are existing objectives for the area which influence overall project goals. Two goals for the night were identified as first to identify the type of land uses desired within the project area. The second, what specific goals and objective are there for certain elements such as housing, infrastructure, fiscal objectives and others.

Jim Brass interrupted to inform the board that Jeff Evans had arrived and that there was now a Quorum of the Planning Commission.

Karen then directed the discussion to the goals leading up to this point. These include walkability, mixed use, and varied housing. Other concerns were the location of retail pads and office pads as well as the need for balance.

The scope of the project was discussed, whether it will or should be regional or local in scope, as well as how regional transportation will affect the development. Jeff Dredge commented regarding the need to not overlook parking requirements.

Karen asked what the primary goals of the plan are. They should include retail goals and what part of area is a TOD. Also goals should include how to provide basic needs, small grocery store, bank branch, cleaners, etc. She stated that walking becomes the experience with human scale development and that it is benefited by multiple paths through an area. Natural amenities should be capitalized upon to provide open space and paths.

Karen asked what the amenities are. Those listed include visibility from state and freeway, as well as the Murray Laundry Tower. Krista Dunn mentioned that access is very poor to the area. The need to improve infrastructure is a driving force behind this RDA

Jim Brass then read a statement concerning Redevelopment Funds and the soccer stadium.

Based upon media accounts, there appears to be a misunderstanding as to what Murray City, through its Redevelopment Agency ("RDA"), has proposed to do in regards to a soccer stadium. The Murray location of the soccer stadium would be in an area of the City known as the Fireclay Redevelopment Survey Area which is often referred to as the "Fireclay Area."

First, there has been no proposal by the RDA regarding the purchase of land for a soccer stadium. The RDA has made no decisions about financial assistance for a soccer stadium. The RDA is aware of a proposal made by the City's Economic Development Advisory Board and its recommendations to the Mayor. The proposal made by the Economic Advisory Board was to inform representatives of the Salt Lake ReAl that there is an excellent location for a soccer stadium in Murray. A proposal made by the Economic Development Advisory Board made no reference to financial assistance.

Nonetheless, any decisions regarding use of the public funds in the Fireclay Area must be made by the RDA.

Second, the use of public funds to facilitate the development of the Fireclay Area must be determined by the RDA through a lengthy, statutory process. The RDA is the initial stages of the process for the Fireclay Area. On January 18, 2005, the RDA made a determination of blight for the Fireclay Area. Before the RDA is even able to consider using tax increment funds, it must prepare and adopt an RDA Plan, receive approval from the taxing entity committee, approve rules for owner participation and relocation assistance and negotiate development agreements. It is anticipated that it will take several months to complete the RDA process for the Fireclay Area.

Accordingly, the RDA is in no position to discuss, let alone commit, funds to projects in the Fireclay Area. It is anticipated that if funds are available, the RDA intends to use those funds for infrastructure such as access roads, water, sewer and power upgrades. The RDA does not intend to use funds to purchase land for a soccer stadium.

The City still welcomes the soccer stadium to the Fireclay Area. The City believes that the Fireclay Area is the best location for the soccer stadium. Nonetheless, the City is hesitant to use public funds to purchase land or provide other direct financial assistance for a soccer stadium.

Jim Brass added his comments that he thinks it is a great area with lots of room and that the public is in favor of the Fireclay location for the stadium.

Statement from Real Salt Lake

Josh Ewing

We're very interested in creating a public/private partnership to make this stadium happen, wherever it happens in the Salt Lake Valley. We think it will be a great thing for Utah in general, for the valley, and for the municipality that it's located in. Mostly we'd just like to answer questions and start the dialog. I think many of you have already a lot of the drawings and what we're contemplating in terms of the stadium, what it might look like. We are obviously very early in the stages of this. Basically what we are planning is a stadium that is about a 20 to 22 thousand seat stadium. It's going to have to have some parking that goes along with it. It is an open air stadium, very much a modern facility. Its not just something with steel girders thrown out in the middle of a parking lot somewhere, it needs to be part of a community. Now it can be a part of any community, you can plop this down in a residential area that already exists. It needs to be designed into a community so that people that are living close by know what they're getting into. It's an exciting thing, its not like you're not going to be able to hear it across the street, you will, its going to be a soccer team. If you look at other cities around the country, housing and mixed use development go very well with stadiums. Take a look at Coors field in Denver, all sorts of housing development went next to that. It is a mix of affordable and higher end housing there that went along with it. That's very much our plan, to have this integrated into the neighborhood feel. It has to be the right fit, it has to

be something that you all think is good for Murray. We need to need to work with the cities, wherever we end up going, in terms of how to make this a successful enterprise, both for the public and all the public and economic spin-offs and for the team. If it's not a successful team, it's not going to be really good for the community.

Tom Love

As Josh said, the stadiums are designed to go in the community. This particular design and artistic rendering was designed to go in the Earl Holding 4th South and Main Community, that why its designed the way it is. It has retail on both sides. We recognize that in Murray's site it would take a different design, there wouldn't be as much retail on either side, it will be much more of a soccer stadium. The retail in the Murray site would be more located on all of the surrounding acreage. This is designed to be a visibly downtown location. One thing I would like to point out is that in part of this design, there are some sports themed things that are in line, restaurants and a Nike town, those kinds of shops we would like to encourage. There's also a broadcast studio that's a big part of this that is a sister company to the soccer team that Dave Checketts also owns that will be broadcasting starting the fall of 2006. All of the Mountain West Conference sports will be broadcast on this 24 hour regional sports network called CSTV. Right now, CSTV is going to be located in either Salt Lake City or Denver, and the stadium is part of that equation. Hopefully it will be located it in Salt Lake City and if it is its home will be inside the stadium. So that would be another 100 jobs.

The board and representatives from the team discussed the retail components of the stadium. They also discussed other event uses for the stadium.

Jeff Dredge raised a question about the feasibility of community scale retail such a dry cleaners or a corner store. He said that it's easy to say that the board wants this in the area, but that this type of development needs to be market driven. He asked Karen how to find the balance in the plan between the ideal desire and market forces. He said that a developer still has to come in a build it and someone has to lease it and put in a bagel shop or other type of business, and these parties may not find it economically feasible to do.

Karen responded by explaining calculations to determine internally driven retail needs based on housing densities versus what has to come from outside to support various levels of retail square footage. She continued by agreeing that it is difficult to force a retail configuration that doesn't exist. So one of the things to do as the plan is being discussed is to take into account what kind of retail configurations there are. For example when talking about groceries, is it a 3,000 square foot grocery store on the ground floor of a building, is it a 30,000 square foot small format grocery store or is it something else. Those are the issues that need to be considered. Discussion will be in terms of what those formats are that are workable formats. She concurred that it's not prudent to try to create something that no one can ever build.

Next housing goals were discussed, the first being multiple price points. Karen said low income housing doesn't make very much sense. If we want to bring lots of people into the area, which should be a goal, it can't be all low income housing.

Other concerns mentioned were:

- Apartment cause problems for the school district.

- Want owner occupied

- High density

- Minimum 30 units per acre.

- Density concerns, the problem isn't the number it's the design.

- Parking, traffic, utilities, other impacts.

Don Mullen

This has to be a community effort, what works well for the community works for us. There is a difference between what we would like to see and what reality is. At a certain point in density there is a trade off with parking. Do you want density, do you want higher end? Do doctors want to spend 400,000 for a nice condo between two rail road tracks. It's all a trade off, its not that it can or can't happen. It's a question of what works here, because what works for Murray is probably what's going to work for development. We have spent a lot of time and money doing research on the feasibility of retail and residential.

Krista asked if anybody wants a condo between the tracks, and second why does the housing just have to be between the tracks.

Don replied that people do want to live there and there's ways to mitigate the sound that are used when building near traffic or a freeway. Part of the problem with other areas is contamination. As a developer the more multiple price points you have the better it is because you have a bigger market. What is the reality of what the range of price point is?

Karen reiterated that urban density supports small urban retail fabric. The intent is to work and plan this so that the market will drive the proper development in there. We do have property owners here and they will be included in the process. That was accomplished in the public input hearings.

Other uses were discussed including:

- Open space

- Eating establishments

- Commercial office space

- Hotel space

- High tech/biomedical

- Entertainment

These uses could be integrated into a graduated design criteria based on distance from the TRAX station.

Karen then addressed fiscal goals. The first goal is the need to develop increment to pay for this. Retail is a big piece of that with sales tax and also with the property tax increment. 100 acres is a fair amount of land but it doesn't have to take forever to develop. Karen asked if it is the objective of the city to have something happening in the near term on this project?

The response was that everyone would like to have it done now. The plan is the most important part, so the question is when the board wants the plan done.

Karen said that it's feasible to do it in a couple of months, that's a reasonable goal. Also, the plan can be adopted without the taxing entity committee in place.

Optimistic plan completion August 2005, construction 2006

Jim Brass requested a flow chart with statutory dates and deadlines.

The group then discussed the increment payout period.

Next was a discussion of infrastructure needs

Fireclay extension to the west

North/South access

Cottonwood street, through the project, or on main street? Western alignment of Cottonwood Street affects ability to put single user on Gibbons parcel. Also impacts walkability with main thoroughfare through TOD core. Additionally an overpass is very expensive. The sole purpose of Cottonwood Street is to carry traffic.

Keith passed out a worksheet showing feedback from development review board concerning the costs of fireclay area infrastructure needs.

Karen returned back to retail goals

There should be a variety of scale, uses and types. There should be enough flexibility in the plan to let the market dictate feasible development.

Inclusion of other types of businesses such as professional office, business cultivation, professional services, medical, legal.

Larger box is not a walkable component. It's important in this area to preserve walkability and attractive urban design.

Karen crystallized critical items to success

Remember walkable scale

Parking should be shared parking with a balance between structured and surface

Don't let the plan limit potential or ideas, don't create a barrier to creativity.